10/10/71

Dear Howard,

As I begin to check through the notes for corrections for the two earlier parts, I find again your 8/31/ I am delighted that you are as enamored of Sylvia's work as you should be, for it is magnificent. I am disappointed that you did not check the citation to my own (WW 169ff), where, as I told you without, apparently, getting through to you, I did say what you want me to say, and I did go into it, there and elsewhere, in quite some detail. You might want to begin the preceeding page. It may well be that SM's handling adds to mine, but I want to be consistent, and I can't single one thing out just for credit without suggesting that there are not other things she also does not duplicate or carry further. I am, I think, generous in crediting and referring to the work in a different way. There are several other problems this kind of thing raises with which you should be familiar for your own writing: writers in general agreement need not always be in specific agreement A reference of this kind, without careful rereading of it and everything relevant in another book, can lead to confusion. The second is the general attitude of the critical community where one is credited and another who covered the same area is not. You should see the flack I've had to duck on this.

No, I am not steaming. But you should have checked my own work to which I referred and where what you suggest is cited and could not be more explicit.

This picks up again on 180. There is more that I believe I cited, in WW alone. I'm now filing your 8/31/71 with your corres.

Earlier today I told you of a new a special pressure. This compels me to more speed, and there there is no specific reference to what you think should be eliminated (I'm on your 9/3/71), I'm not permitting myself the time to reread again because I have rread these chapters and have done some cutting. Probably not as much as you'd like. What you consider "directly relevant" I may disagree with. I believe what may seem to be irrelevant goes context, esp. political context, which has importances.

Chapter 2: disagree entirely.

Ch 4: Don't recall what you mean by the new Specter gems. But if anything is to be added, I'll now have to restrict it to the appendix and I welcoming specific ref.

CH 5 disagree also.

Ch 6: I've cut all Post stuff heavily, someplaces entirely, added specific ref to Wiggins, and I must remember to dd that he became amb to the UN, his reward. It appears that I have done what you suggest.

Excellent suggestion on 6H25. Wish you'd also suggested pp in I, but I've made a note to make a citation and perhaps add a sentence. I'm considering a series of notes before the App where these kkinds of things can be vriefly noted, if any more suggest themselves and there isn't space within a chapter. I've done some cutting I didn't want to do simply to save a page.

Ch &: some cutting at beginning done.

Ch 8 You gotta be outta your mind to suggest eliginating Reynolds stuff. But I have done some cutting and I see a few brief adds.

Ch 9 I've taken about 3 pp out. But I can't at this point even think of such reorganizations as you suggest.

This ltr also added to corres file. Noted on Gold, Slawson, error. I'll get those long things out separately, but if you've not given pp. I'll not now have time. I have notes on adds I want to make and should but won't be able to.

If the COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS dated 8/13/71 are yours, this is an excellent form. I can use it fast. It is unsigned. Ditto with note on attached docs re Specter.

Have found these and will get on them and other notes you didn't remove, poss RB's I also find note to self to get CD1395 46-8 on skull pieces, to get. My cards do not indicate I did. If you have and haven't supplied, I'd appreciate.

Gotta rush.